

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/821,571	MCCAFFREY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gordon J. Stock	2877	

All Participants:

(1) Gordon J. Stock.

(2) Attorney Ian McLeod.

Status of Application: after non-final

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 1 March 2005

Time: 3:00 pm

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 6, 9, 13, 17, 25, 26, 28-30, 32, 34-36, 39, 43, 46, 50, 56-59, 62

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:
Specifically, an amendment to the claims was discussed to overcome possible objections to a lack of antecedent basis in regards to specific limitations: "other entity capable of generating chemilumiscence," "other entity capable of chemically reacting to generate chemiluminescence", "electro-conductive plastic," "colored glass," "bandpass filter, band-limited filter and combination of these" and other limitations lacking antecedent basis and to clarify terms ITO, L1, and L2. See Examiner's Amendent attached.